



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,320	03/18/2004	Janaki Kumar	13906-142001 / 2003P00614	7310
32864	7590	10/05/2007	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			PESIN, BORIS M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2174		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/05/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

D

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/804,320	KUMAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Boris Pesin	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to amendment filed 7/12/2007.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 17 and 18 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 7/12/2007, Claims 1, 8, 17 and 18 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,466,663 (hereinafter Ravenscroft) in view of Anderson et al. (US 7046789).

As per claim 1, Ravenscroft discloses of "computer program product comprising executable program instructions that when executed by a processor provide an

interaction center manager's graphical user interface on an interconnected display device, the manager's graphical user interface" by a graphical user interface of a workstation is displayed which is processed by a processor (Ravenscroft column 4 lines 26-40). In particular, "an overview area displaying at least one user-selected group statistic that relates to a user-selected group of interaction center agents being monitored" by viewing information of each agent on a graphical user interface (Ravenscroft column 1 lines 39-45); "a detailed area displaying a list of each of the user-selected group of interaction center agents being monitored and further displaying for each of the listed agents at least one user-selected individual statistic relating to the listed agents" by monitoring activities of agents upon a display as part of the graphical user interface (Ravenscroft column 1 lines 32-37).

Ravenscroft does not specifically teach at least one user-selected group statistic having been selected from among a plurality of predefined group statistics configured to be monitored, and at least one user-selected individual statistic having been selected from among a plurality of predefined individual statistics configured to be monitored. Anderson teaches at least one user-selected group statistic having been selected from among a plurality of predefined group statistics configured to be monitored, and at least one user-selected individual statistic having been selected from among a plurality of predefined individual statistics configured to be monitored ("A plurality of task statistics viewing options corresponding to each of the task classes are presented to the user such that contact statistics data within the task classes corresponding to a selected task statistics viewing option is displayed. The method can also include the step of

presenting the user with task statistic viewing option preferences, allowing the user to create a user-defined task statistics viewing option." Column 5, Lines 17-24 and Figures 12 and 19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ravenscroft with the teachings of Anderson and include a system wherein the user is able to select specific statistics to monitor with the motivation to provide the user with more pertinent information on the screen, in other words the user will be able to select the specific information he wants without having extraneous information on the screen.

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Ravenscroft discloses "user-selected statistics are associated with user-created profiles that represent different sets of statistics displayed on the graphical user interface" by displaying requested statistical information on the graphical user interface (Ravenscroft column 5 lines 43-45).

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Ravenscroft discloses "the display in the detailed area comprises one or more of the interaction center agent's name, queues, key figures for each queue, statistical measurements and alerts" by displaying agent's name, statistical measurements, and queues as shown by Fig. 10 in area 92 and 200 (Ravenscroft Fig. 10).

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Ravenscroft discloses "the at least one user-selected monitored statistic includes an availability state or a

communication state for each of the listed agents" by displaying a view of the agent's state of availability and state of communication as shown by Fig. 11 in area 256 and 260 (Ravenscroft Fig. 11).

As per claim 8, Ravenscroft discloses of method for a graphical user interface, in particular, "receiving a selection of interaction center agents to be monitored using the manager's graphical user interface" by showing a view of which agents are selected as shown in Fig. 6 by section 136A and 136B (Ravenscroft Fig. 6); "receiving a selection of an overview statistic that characterizes an activity of an interaction center so that the overview statistic as applied to the selected agents to be monitored is displayed in an overview area of the graphical user interface" by displaying the statistics of the agents in an area that allows for full view of activities as shown in Fig. 10 section 92 (Ravenscroft Fig. 10); "receiving a selection of a detailed statistic that characterizes an activity of an interaction center agent so that the selected detailed statistic associated with each of the selected agents is displayed in a detailed area of the graphical user interface" by a display of detailed statistics of each individual agent is monitored in an area as shown in Fig. 10 section 200 (Ravenscroft Fig. 10).

Ravenscroft does not specifically teach an overview statistic being selected from among a plurality of predefined group statistics configured to be monitored, and detailed statistic having been selected from among a plurality of predefined individual statistics configured to be monitored. Anderson teaches an overview statistic being selected from among a plurality of predefined group statistics configured to be monitored, and

detailed statistic having been selected from among a plurality of predefined individual statistics configured to be monitored ("A plurality of task statistics viewing options corresponding to each of the task classes are presented to the user such that contact statistics data within the task classes corresponding to a selected task statistics viewing option is displayed. The method can also include the step of presenting the user with task statistic viewing option preferences, allowing the user to create a user-defined task statistics viewing option." Column 5, Lines 17-24 and Figures 12 and 19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ravenscroft with the teachings of Anderson and include a system wherein the user is able to select specific statistics to monitor with the motivation to provide the user with more pertinent information on the screen, in other words the user will be able to select the specific information he wants without having extraneous information on the screen.

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and claim 9 contains the same limitations as claim 3 and is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in connection with claim 3.

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and claim 14 contains the same limitations as claim 5 and is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in connection with claim 5.

Claims 17 and 18 are similar in scope to claim 8; therefore they are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft-Anderson further in view of Judkins et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,587,556 (hereinafter Judkins).

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of "the at least one user-selected statistic is selected from a group consisting of an average handling time, an average speed of answer, an abandonment rate, an average talk time, an average response time, calls per hour, calls per day, total calls by channel and total calls by state". However, Judkins teaches of "the at least one user-selected statistic is selected from a group consisting of an average handling time, an average speed of answer, an abandonment rate, an average talk time, an average response time, calls per hour, calls per day, total calls by channel and total calls by state" by having all call statistics available as shown in Fig. 57, Fig. 60, and Fig. 61 (Judkins Fig. 57, Fig. 60, and Fig. 61).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ravenscroft-Anderson with the call statistics teaching of Judkins. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because having the call statistics available allows for evaluation of call center performance in any call center system (Judkins column 1 lines 44-46).

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and claim 13 contains the same limitations as claim 4 and is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in connection with claim 4.

Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft-Anderson further in view of Hugh U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2003/0137536 A1 (hereinafter Hugh).

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of "the communicate state is selected from a group consisting of an active chat state, an active phone state, an active email state, and an active paging state". However, Hugh teaches of "the communicate state is selected from a group consisting of an active chat state, an active phone state, an active email state, and an active paging state" by providing interaction through email, instant messaging, paging, phone calls, and SMS (Hugh Abstract lines 5-8).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the call center manager of Ravenscroft-Anderson with the interaction of Hugh. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because having the interaction available allows the system to show user of changes or other events by those means (Hugh Abstract lines 9-10).

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated and claim 15 contains the same limitations as claim 6 and is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in connection with claim 6.

Claims 7, 10-12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft-Anderson further in view of Chee et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,526,397 (hereinafter Chee).

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of “the at least one user-selected monitored statistic includes a work schedule or a set of skills for each of the listed agents”. However, Chee teaches of “the at least one user-selected monitored statistic includes a work schedule or a set of skills for each of the listed agents” by providing a skill set option for a selected agent (Chee column 6 lines 56-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the call center manager of Ravenscroft-Anderson with the skill set option of Chee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because having the skill set option available allows calls to be timely answered by the agent with the appropriate skill set to handle the call (Chee column 1 lines 11-13).

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of "receiving a selection of threshold values associated with each key figure". However, Chee teaches of "receiving a selection of threshold values associated with each key figure" by providing threshold levels for call statistics (Chee column 5 lines 35-46).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the call center manager of Ravenscroft-Anderson with the threshold level option of Chee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because having the threshold levels available allows for easier indication of changing color for a statistic represented on a display (Chee column 7 lines 54-57).

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of "providing an alert when a key figure exceeds the selected threshold value associated with the key figure". However, Chee teaches of "providing an alert when a key figure exceeds the selected threshold value associated with the key figure" by providing an alert in the form of change in color of a statistic or warning sound when a threshold level has been breached (Chee column 7 lines 54-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the call center manager of Ravenscroft-Anderson with the alert option of Chee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

do so because having the alert available will bring the attention of the graphical user interface to the user (Chee column 5 lines 39-43).

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of "the alert comprises a visual indication on the display". However, Chee teaches of "the alert comprises a visual indication on the display" by providing an alert in the form of change in color of a statistic (Chee column 7 lines 54-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the call center manager of Ravenscroft-Anderson with the visual indication option of Chee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because having the visual indication available will bring the attention of the graphical user interface to the user (Chee column 5 lines 39-43).

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and claim 16 contains the same limitations as claim 7 and is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in connection with claim 7.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100